

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/829,315	STUDIN, JOEL R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Humera N. Sheikh	1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Humera N. Sheikh. (3) _____

(2) Phillip R. Kiefer. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 09 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Declaration under 1.131.

Claim(s) discussed: 17-29.

Identification of prior art discussed: Zhang et al. (US 6,528,086); Herb et al. (US 5,534,246).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


HUMERA N SHEIKH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the 1.131 Declaration submitted on 04/13/07. More specifically, Applicant indicated that the 1.131 Declaration demonstrates formulation and testing of Scarguard on psoriasis prior to 09/28/99, the earliest filing date of Zhang and thus antedates and overcomes the primary reference. Applicant's arguments were found persuasive. Accordingly, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the Final Office Action filed 07/09/07, in view of the filing of the Declaration under 1.131. Examiner indicated that a non-final office action will be issued in due course.